

REMARKS

Claims 1, 8-10, and 15-20 are pending in the present application, with claim 1 being independent. Claims 2-7 and 11-13 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Specification

The Examiner objected to the title of the invention for not being descriptive. Applicant submits herewith a new title. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 18-20 for being difficult to comprehend. The claims have been amended to make them clearer, and to more appropriately define the present invention. The amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kaneko et al. (US 6,505,347; hereafter "Kaneko"). This rejection is respectfully traversed, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims.

Initially, Applicant points out that the cancellation of claims 2-7 and 11-13 has rendered this rejection moot as it pertains to such claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, "adjusting the amount of information in the type of table." In page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the aforementioned feature is taught by Kaneko, citing column 17, lines 10-27. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Kaneko teaches, in column 17, lines 11-15, that "[w]hen the amount of data of each table is greater than a preselected threshold value [...] sub-tables thereof are divided into sub-groups." Applicants respectfully submit that this does not represent any adjustment of the amount of data in a type of table. If the relevant part of Kaneko is studied in conjunction with Fig. 17, it will be readily understood that the table (SEIT), as well as each of the sub-tables (SEIT0, SEIT1, SEIT2, SEIT3), contains the same amount of data at all times.

When Kaneko describes that the sub-tables are "divided into sub-groups," Kaneko merely teaches that the sub-tables are sorted into multiple sub-groups (e.g., SEIT0 and SEIT1 are in Sub-group 0, while SEIT2 and SEIT3 are in Sub-group 1), rather than being contained in one group (e.g., PMT0, PMT1, and PMT2 are in one group). In other words, in Kaneko, the content of each sub-table is the same regardless of whether the sub-tables are in a single group, or sorted into multiple sub-groups.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Kaneko fails to disclose each and every claim feature recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to independent claim 1.

Furthermore, dependent claims 8-10 and 14-20 should be considered allowable at least because they depend on an allowable base claim. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8-10 and 14-20 is also respectfully requested.

Conclusion


In view of the above amendments and remarks, this application appears to be in condition for allowance and the Examiner is, therefore, requested to reexamine the application and pass the claims to issue.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Jason Rhodes (Reg. No. 47,305) at telephone number (703) 205-8000, which is located in the Washington, DC area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 21, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By  #39,491
Michael K. Mutter
Registration No.: 29,680
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Rd
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant